
BRENDA BREWER:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Membership Call on 18th August at 15:00 UTC. Today's meeting is recorded. Please state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. We have received apologies from Barbara Wanner.

And with that, I'll turn the meeting over to BC chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.

MASON COLE:

Thanks, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Glad to have you on the call today on 18 August. Where's the summer going?

So, our agenda is up on the screen. I suspect we're going to have a lighter than usual crowd today because so many people are out on vacation. But we'll proceed with our normal agenda.

But before we do, are there any updates or additions to the agenda as you see it on the screen, please? Okay. All right, thanks very much. We're going to dive right in. And we've got plenty of time left, so Steve, go ahead and take the floor, please. And we'll head for the policy calendar.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. So the policy calendar is displayed now, and there are no open public comments immediately. We filed on 2 of August a comment on the Transfer Policy. ICANN then subsequently close that comment period. So Zak and Arinola, could you give us some assessment of the range of comments that came in? I know the staff hasn't assessed them yet, but what has come in and how does that relate to what we were asking for?

ZAK MUSKOVITCH: Hi, Steve. I haven't reviewed the submitted public comments in detail. I took a cursory review of them, and my general assessment is that the BC's comment was consistent with many of them and focused on a couple of the issues that will likely result in further discussion amongst the working group. And so I reserve any further comments about the nature of the public comments at this time.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Thanks, Zak. Arinola, anything to add?

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Nothing, really. I think Zak already made that. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. All right. As I said before, there are no open public comments right now. Thankfully, they give us a break in August. [But they'll] have to plan it in the middle of winter. So that's fine by me. The three comments that are expected in August ... And then we are

halfway through August and they're not posted yet, so I don't know how soon. But I wanted to note three that are going to be of interest to us.

And the first is the ATRT3 recommendation on the Holistic Review. This is something that came out of the last Accountability and Transparency Review Team who said that ICANN needs to look at the entirety of its structure. That's what they mean by a Holistic Review. If they were to do so, the BC, the IPC, and the ISPs are hopeful that this would be an opportunity to give the business community a little more say in GNSO policy.

And one of our allies could be ALAC. And ALAC is also interested in seeing whether ALAC can participate in GNSO. In other words, it's a way to balance out the impact of the contracted parties who have 50% veto [power], and then our side which is split in half between Non-Commercial and Commercial.

So that is an important review for us, and it's one where I am anxious to get a volunteer or two that will assist me at working on that. Mark, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you, Steve. Not necessarily volunteering, as I have my plate full. But the ALAC Team is one that I would like to highlight. This has been somewhat of a point of contention in Council, and it really shouldn't be. There are certainly all sorts of reasons why people are trying to do this.

But from our perspective, I think that we should really capitalize on the fact that ALAC is incredibly interested in this right now. It is becoming

kind of a battle cry for them. They are rallying around this, and we should show as much support as we can because most of their positions are actually very aligned with ours. It's rare that we are too misaligned with them. And potentializing the BC's work with ALAC would probably only allow us to get further. So, a big take on this and the suggestion that we really take this seriously. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Right. And the Terms of Reference would limit what we could look at. And if it limits it too tightly, then we won't be able to initiate true change in the balance of power at ICANN. And I have been able ...

The ALAC invited me to address their leadership team twice on this, and I indicated that one of the most palatable fixes is a BC proposal from three or four years ago where we say that at the Board level, some of those eight seats that are in the NomCom should be reallocated. And we thought two more should go to GNSO so that the GNSO could have separate seats for the Registries and Registrars and separate seats for the Commercial and the Non-Commercial. Instead of this taking turns that we do with the NCPH, Non-Contracted Parties House. We take turns with the NCSG.

And Mark is right. The ALAC has a high priority on consumer protection when it comes to the Internet. The NCSG has a much higher priority on privacy, to the extent where they don't even care if that impacts consumer protection. So that's why we're anxious to see some kind of a restructuring to balance the powers differently.

Are there anyone on the BC that would assist me at reviewing this Terms of Reference? It's not even started yet. The comment hasn't opened yet, and I'm just trying to line up some interest. Okay.

All right, the second one that is coming up soon is something I'm going to ask David to speak to. David, you're still with us? Yes, David Sneed is still here. So David will be able to speak a little bit to this because ...

I am so grateful, we ought to be grateful, that David stepped up to take over the reins from Alex Deacon who ... His clients have taken him in a slightly different direction. He won't be doing much on ICANN anymore.

So what are we looking at right now? We'll have a comment period on the Expedited Policy Development Process for Phase 1. And this was, of course, what came out of the Temporary Specification resulting from GDPR. And so we are now looking at, years and years later, how is the implementation going? What has to be completed? And Alex is an expert on this, along with Mark Svancarek, Margie Milam. I've been a participant. But we need some help.

And David, thank you for stepping up. And I know you were going to talk to Alex. Tell us about where you think that's going to go, when it will begin, and whether we can arrange other volunteers.

DAVID SNEAD:

So I can't speak to the latter, but it likely is going to be open for comment next week. That's what I think, actually, what the IRT is saying. Alex and I chatted for about a half an hour last week, and he's

recommending that our comment be focused on the fact that ICANN has not negotiated DPAs yet. And we discussed that.

I've been following the IRT as an observer as opposed to a participant, so to the extent there are other comments we need to make, I'm happy to include those. I'm also working with the IPC. I've reached out to them to coordinate comments. So that's where things are.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfect. I really appreciate it, David.

DAVID SNEAD: Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: When we come out of the other end of this comment process, we would happily invite you to represent us on the Implementation Review Team if you're so inclined. So please do be thinking about that. Thank you.

DAVID SNEAD: I will think about that. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Another thing we want to think about is whether RDAP has been implemented. That was called for four years ago, and we still haven't pulled that off. Okay?

DAVID SNEAD: Okay, thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Next one up is near and dear to Mark Datysgeld's heart. And that is the implementation of Universal Acceptance. And of course, this is domain names for purposes of e-mail and look up. Domain names in scripts that are other than Latin scripts, and particular ... So, IDNs but also very long scripts because there are still many systems in different parts of the world that expect the top-level domain to only be three characters long. Right? So that's not going to work.

So we do expect a brand new roadmap for how the registries and registrars will modify their systems to be sure that they can handle all of the domain names and all of the different IDN scripts.

And then, let me turn to #4. No public comment on this, but we're happy to have Andrew Bennett who has been so helpful at trying to navigate our way through what NIS 2 is going to look like as it emerges from the European Union and transposition of the member states. So Drew had nothing new when I talked to him two days ago on this because we're still waiting on the very final version to come out.

And I wondered whether there's anyone on the BC call right now out who knows enough to add any late-breaking information?

MASON COLE: Steve, I can give an update.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please do, thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you. So, you're right. Drew, with some help from Nick [Laudergan], have been championing the BC effort on NIS 2. And they've done a wonderful job with it. I think we got about 75-80% of what we were looking for out of the initial draft of, specifically Article 23 and the relevant parts of NIS 2. What happens now is after the language is finally approved—which should be, I guess, in early September—then it'll head to member states for what's called transposition. And that's when they transpose the directive into binding member state law.

And so the BC, what we've done, is we've reconstituted the Drafting Team that was responsible for our early input on NIS 2. And that's myself, Margie Milam, Nick, Drew, and, Marie. And we're working through a plan on how to influence NIS 2 as it gets transposed into member state law.

So I think I've covered pretty much everything. If Marie's on the call, she might be able to add some detail. But I think I got most of it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. In our meeting with Bart, a member of the European Parliament, he encouraged us to take a hard look at certain nation states that could implement sooner than later. Denmark, who already has significant registrant disclosure policies for their ccTLD, is a country that could move rather quickly to impose the same requirements on the

gTLDs that serve its country's residents or gTLDs belonging to businesses and entities that are in that country. So we're going to want to target our efforts, I think, at nations that can move most quickly because they could become a model for other nations, too.

Any further questions or comments on NIS 2? I have something to add about it a little bit later.

Let me turn now to Council. So we had a Council meeting on the 21st of July. So we've already covered a recap of that on previous meetings. The next Council meeting comes up next week, the 25th of August. The agenda was just published. So I put it into the policy calendar several items on the agenda, and I'll turn to Mark and Marie to walk you through that.

MARK DATYSGELD: Is Marie available or am—

MARIE PATTULLO: I'm here.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: If you want to kick off, Mark, that's fine. You go for it.

MARK DATYSGELD: You know, I'm not going to pretend that I'm doing anything this month that's not DNS abuse. It's just unrealistic with the draft of the report. So literally, I know nothing about anything else. So, go for it.

MARIE PATTULLO: He knows a lot about a lot of things. That is such an untrue comment. Okay, we've got a meeting next week. Thank you, Steve, for putting the link to the agenda and some of the items up there.

The only two things I would mention right now. A couple of e-mails that we've sent around to you to let you know what's going on in Council and also asking members to tell us what you think. Now the first one—thank you to those who've already reacted—is about so-called closed generics. And in essence about setting up a conversation, a facilitated dialogue, to use the terminology, that would bring some members, obviously, of GAC—so, some governments—and some people from the GNSO, and someone from ALAC to try to get to a framework that we can all agree on so we can move forward.

Basically a close generic ... Think about a dictionary word that's after the dot. At the moment they are theoretically nailed, but not used. There's been all manner of discussion about that, as you know, all of the way through SubPro. SubPro being the group, again as you know, that is looking at—sorry, looked; it's closed—at how we're going to implement new gTLDs in the future.

It couldn't get to an agreement mainly because you've got a bunch of people on one side saying, "Closed generics, evil. There must be closed generics never," and a bunch of people on the exact opposite side

saying, “Every domain name in a whole word should be fine.” Now if we keep going like that, we're never going to get anywhere. And what we need to do is get a bunch of people around the table to talk and try and work out the guardrails, the framework for what actually would work, and then give that framework to Council and have Council set up a PDP.

So that is what we've been asked by Council to think about. Thank you, again, to those who responded to the mail. To Mark and to me, it does seem like a very sensible way forward.

And the other one, which is a mail I sent you later—sorry, I'm obviously not talking correctly today—a mail I sent you earlier today which is about a whole new, fun procedure called the GNSO Guidance Procedure because we need more acronyms in ICANN world.

Now, the GGP is not actually new. It's been around for a long time, but it's never been used. Again, it's to do with our friend, SubPro. How are we going to figure out how to open the new round for new gTLDs? Very complex, very hard, thus many years of SubPro. One of the things that the SubPro Final Report suggested is that there should be a dedicated Implementation Review Team that looks at how we deal with the Applicant Support. Because last time, it was a bit of a mess. So let's get it right. Let's try and do it properly.

This morphed through conversations with various small team Councilors into a brand new, quite scary Steering Committee of 30 people that was then supposed to go off and set up working groups and talk with experts. And quite frankly, that's just not a good plan because the Council already exists and the Council's the one that manages the

process. And please, let's not keep setting up new structures that don't add anything.

So what a bunch of the councilors suggested, and Mark and I very much support, is that as opposed to this great, big, monolithic 30-people structure, let's have a tight group who know what they're doing. You've got expertise in SubPro already who can reach out to the subject matter experts they need, figure out how we move the dial on Applicant Support, report back to Council.

Now again, all of the details on that are in the e-mail that I sent to you earlier, but we were supposed to vote to set up this so-called steering committee last month. And we didn't, for the reasons I've just given you. We didn't vote at all. But we should be voting next week. And I can't speak for Mark here because I don't know what he thinks of the latest version we just saw yesterday, but I like the new version. I think it makes sense.

So please do have a look at the mail we've just sent you. If you've got any comments, we need them before next Thursday because we do need direction for voting.

And Steve, unless you want me to go to anything else or if you want to go to anything else, open for questions, as always.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Marie and Mark. Marie, on the point of close generics, a decade ago the BC was active on this. And the example at the time was .hotels or .hotel. This notion that if a single travel company controlled

.hotels and started to light up second-level domains like search.hotels, familyfriendly.hotes, book.hotels ... If they started setting up generic second-level names and then in a very subtle way, on the content, favored their own properties, that could end up creating serious competition and deception concerns on the part of consumers. And it would be perceived as unfair by other businesses that thought they would get a level playing field with respect to trying to pitch their travel options.

So the BC's whole position was only with regard to a single competitor in the space. We really had no problem with a generic word that was owned by a company who's not in that space. Right? If Amazon, sorry, lights up .kids or Google lights up .blog, it isn't as if those companies are in the space particular and could favor their own content. Right? So it was only with regard to competition and consumer deception.

And so if the BC participates with that same perspective, it's really to raise the profile that whether ICANN takes action or not, we're trying to get the attention of competition authorities in their respective countries. And therefore, the GAC resonated completely with what we were saying. The GAC believed that there were competition concerns and that it would be better that ICANN try to limit the way a single company could control a generic domain in an industry where it was a player.

So to try to summarize, your note did the same thing with the example of .water. And I think you did a great job with that. I was just trying to translate it to some other examples. And I fully support that effort and would participate.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Yeah. That's great, Steve. There's actually, as you know, only going to be one rep from the CSG on this original type group. Now who that's going to be, that's up to CSG, obviously. And what we need is somebody who can come to the table ... We specifically did not want somebody representing ... Because I was on the small team for this. We specifically did not want somebody representing their own SG&C—sorry, stakeholder group or constituency—because then we'd still get stuck in these ridiculous trenches. You know, the two extremes.

So we want people who can come to the table and say, “Yeah. Practically, what can we do?” So we're going to have one CSG rep. And then, Tim, when this happens, when it actually gets kicked off, obviously we'll need to talk with our CSG friends as to who we think that should be.

But having said that, Steve, it doesn't mean that the BBC is not at all going to be involved because whoever's there, we should be feeding all of them. Be they from the GAC, be they from the ALAC, feed them all. This has got to be practical. It's got to work.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Great. Thanks, Marie. Are there any questions or further comments on that?

Marie, Item 6 on your agenda is to discuss the Council's meetings—the bilaterals with the GAC and with the ALAC. And it's interesting that ALAC's topic is one we would certainly support, DNS abuse. The Holistic

Review with ALAC, which is something Mark and I raised earlier. So we should certainly support those two topics that ALAC has suggested.

And then for the GAC, it looks like they wrote four down—the SSAD Light, next rounds is probably going to involve closed generics, DNS abuse, and then Accuracy of Registrant Information. I have to say, I love all six of those, and would welcome your thoughts or Mark's, or anyone else's advice, on how you should react when that comes up on the agenda next week.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Well, I'll go first and then I'll stop talking and hand it over to Mark. Absolutely, all four of them are clearly important subjects. And it's clearly the right people to speak to them about. I'd also like to say I fully support what Mark said about our interrelation and friendship with ALAC. Because, yes, we do agree with them on a lot. We also agree with the GAC on a lot.

And I would hope, as I now segue into Mark, that Mark will be one of our lead speakers like he was at the last ICANN meeting on DNS abuse in these public sessions. Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you, everyone. So things are looking very interesting in the DNS abuse field, actually, right now because we actually have the contracted parties saying in our meetings that, yes, what's currently there is not sufficient. And that, yes, there needs to be further minimal standards. Will we land perfectly where we want and dream? Maybe not.

But we are starting to get them on record really saying, “This is not enough. Definitely, this is not the playing field that we need as a community.” So things are moving at a fairly expedited pace, and my focus has been on really steering the small team towards Kuala Lumpur delivery of a draft report.

What that will allow us to do is, since there's a billion years between meeting C and meeting A again—we'll meet in Kuala Lumpur and then a long time after in Cancún—this will allow us to push that draft report, give the community wiggle room to talk, negotiate, and see what's up, and see how everybody reacts to that. That will give us ample time to initiate things. And the thing is, then we get in Cancun with a very clear view of where we are. And hopefully, we're much farther ahead in the subject than we were before.

So to reiterate very briefly, what we are looking into right now, we are looking into cornering maliciously registered domains. So this is something that has become more or less a consensus. We can now call that more or less a position of the ICANN community, that maliciously registered domains should go. That's DNS abuse, plain and simple. And they should be treated harshly within ICANN and its CPs. Which might seem logical, but you would have a hard time. Imagine where this discussion was at the start, but here we are. It seems like this is pretty much something that's in the works.

And we are working towards activating ICANN Org itself. There's a lot of impression that ICANN Org doesn't do enough about this. They don't do enough outreach. They don't dedicate enough resources/staff. And we are pretty much coming together as a group to really try to get to

Göran, to the Board. They have been looking for guidance from us on the subject, and we want to get out there and just say, "Hey, stop doing nothing. That's really not helping our cause."

So we're coming together under this perspective that we are the people who are working on the system and ICANN Org should be doing so much more. And this has been a good rallying point. Right? We found our common enemy. ICANN Org is not doing enough to help us address this.

So, pretty good looking. That draft report should be done soon-ish. Definitely before KL. Everybody will have time to read it. It will be made public before we go to the meeting, so that should be pretty good. It should give us a lot of substance to talk and points to make, and hopefully make for a good presentation as well as an impactful one.

So that's the general state right now. I'm open to questions from everyone. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mark. This is under the DNS Abuse Small Team where you're the co-lead.

All right, turn next to the other area where we need some help. The Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team where we had Susan Kawaguchi representing us is now a vacancy, as Susan has stepped back completely from doing ICANN work. So we need a volunteer to assist on this scoping team. Toba, I believe, is working on it but has been not able to attend many of these meetings. And I don't see Toba here today,

either. I do not see Toba, so at this point we don't have help and need a second person.

The Scoping Team is in a pause right now. Their job, as described on the screen, is to look at the accuracy of registration data that's maintained by the registrars that collect it. And what are the obligations for verifying the accuracy? As we say every time, we know that the registrars have incredibly accurate data because they're able to charge the registrants for the services they provide. So we know they have sufficient information to be able to work with the financial system—credit card charges and the like.

Do we have anyone on the line ... I see Mason's hand up. Mason, why don't you go first?

MASON COLE:

Thanks, Steve. Yeah, you described this accurately. Susan Kawaguchi stepped back and Toba has not been able to make all of the meetings. I filled in, in the last meeting, just as a way to keep things moving from the BC perspective. We could still use another volunteer if anybody from BC is willing to step up. I'm not going to say it's an easy job. It's some difficult issues.

But the good news is, it's probably not going to last a whole lot longer because, you're right, the team is going to go into pause. So if there is somebody who's willing to step up, I would welcome the help.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Do we have anybody who could join Mason? Again, it would only last a few more months. All right. Thank you, Mason. I appreciate that.

I only had one more. It's the SSAD Light. That's what is now being described by ICANN Org as the WHOIS Disclosure System. And if you recall, the full-blown SSAD was going to be too expensive without any obligatory disclosures. So it wasn't very valuable to us. And so we have been active on a small team who's been trying to refine and reduce the scope of such a project so that it would cost less. But we're still not getting any obligatory disclosures.

What I've done is summarize for you, there on the screen, the six bullet points that came out of that presentation that ICANN gave was last week. And they are trying to make this very lightweight. It's really just to ... If you're a requester, you stuff an e-mail into the system saying, "I would like this particular domain name information."

ICANN will run a quick RDAP query to verify the domain names. The gTLD, it will tell them who the registrar is. They'll then go immediately to that registrar and relay what you requested. And that's about it. There's no obligation on the registrars to read the e-mail or to respond. And if they did respond, they would do so directly to you, the requester. And ICANN is really not involved.

The good news is that they're not going to try to charge requesters for making this. But at this point, where's the value? Right? Because the disclosure decisions are made entirely by the registrar on their own discretion. And I believe that the data that we'll gather is minimal. Right? We're not going to learn very much other than who maybe are

the registrars who refuse to even acknowledge. But the system itself won't tell us whether a registrar acknowledged.

So I asked the question, I said, "How will you address the new requirements that could come out of adoption of NIS2?" And naturally in the chat, there was some comments about the fact that nobody has transposed it yet. Yeah, yeah, I know that. But within several months, we are likely to see at least one country transpose the NIS 2. So ICANN should not put its head in the sand. They ought to be aware of the accuracy and publication requirements that are in NIS 2.

So staff replied to me that they're aware of it and they'll take it into account of the design, if they're directed to implement. Which means they're listening to management at ICANN Org. And I don't think management is going to direct implementation of NIS 2 requirements unless and until we have something that's at least been adopted by the European Parliament, even if it hasn't been transposed yet.

So that's my report on SSAD Light. And before I turn it over to Tim Smith, are there any further questions for the GNSO Council channel? We should expect an SSAD report prior to going into Kuala Lumpur.

Okay, Tim Smith, let me turn it over to you as early our liaison for the CSG.

TIM SMITH:

Thanks, Steve. And much of the activity over the past while has been on preparing for ICANN75. And as is noted here, we will be having a CSG membership meeting during ICANN75. And we identified a few topics

that we wanted to discuss with Org executive—DNS abuse, auction proceeds, planning prioritization process. And invitations have been sent to Göran and to Xavier. I think we've now heard from Göran that he has a conflict at that time, so I don't know who will represent the executive. But that's still taking shape, of course.

We will also have a meeting with the ICANN Board, which is actually immediately after the CSG membership meeting, I think, on Tuesday the 20th. So the Board has asked us—as you see a question there—what collaborative actions should community, Board, and Org be undertaking to further progress achieving our strategic priority? So that's something we'll be giving some thought to. I welcome any thoughts from anybody on this call about that.

We also have been invited by CPH to a meeting, so we're in the process of sorting out what are the topics of discussion. Within the CSG we agreed that DNS abuse is something we want to talk about. So that will be taking place as well.

And I guess we have been sort of canvassing NCSG and the Contracted Party House to determine their positions with relation to the upcoming elections. So I haven't heard back from either of them at this point, but by the time we get to Kuala Lumpur, I'm sure we'll have more information.

And then I guess the other thing on Planning Prioritization, there will be ongoing discussions or ongoing groups on an annual basis to take a look at the priorities, as was done last year. Although we haven't seen all of the priorities for FY23. But the group for FY24 is starting to get

convened, and Susan Payne has offered to be part of that again this year. Of course, she was the CSG participant last year with [Philippe] as an alternate.

And then I guess, finally on this report, the CSG dinner that we talked about a couple of weeks ago has now been confirmed for September 19th on the Monday in Kuala Lumpur. There will be 12 participants across the different CSG groups. And from the BC you see Mason, Mark, Lawrence, and Steve will be representing the Business Constituency.

And that's about it. I guess the one thing that I didn't put in this report is that, you know, often before or surrounding an ICANN meeting, CSG has a meeting with the GNSO-appointed Board members, which Matthew Shears often chairs. We decided not to have a meeting before this ICANN75, but will be having one sometime before the end of the year.

So that is it for me. I'll happily take any questions. And just to the point being made earlier by Marie with the GGP, I'll be looking into that a little bit more closely and be following that closely.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Tim. It looks like it's going to be very active CSG meeting in KL, so we'll be looking to you for lots of guidance. Any questions for Tim?

TIM SMITH:

Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I noted in the chat that when Org talks about strategic priorities, they are often not very helpful to us. Anything we ask them to do in a way of consumer protection gets shunted off because they don't want to get involved in content. Which is why we don't get any help on DNS abuse. We don't get any help on contract enforcement. And Org's strategic priorities are rarely that interesting. So I don't really know how that's going to go when we meet with the Board on that. We're going to have to encourage—

TIM SMITH: Good point.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. All right, I don't see any other comments, and I will turn it back over to Mason. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve. Good run through of the policy calendar. And thanks very much.

There's an item on the agenda, if you can keep the policy calendar up for a minute. There's an item on the agenda about preparations for ICANN75. I'll just highlight what those are right there. Tim covered several of them. Well, we just lost it.

But I would encourage everybody primarily that if you do plan to go to KL—there you go, thanks—there are some preparations that you need to make. You need to register for the meeting. You need to download

an app from the Malaysian government that's related to their COVID 19 protections. There are several steps that you need to take in order to be a successful participant at ICANN75. And I urge you not to wait until the last minute.

Perhaps I can impose on Brenda to be a resource here. I think, Brenda, you've sent out an e-mail to everybody already that's registered for ICANN75 with that information. Am I right about that?

BRENDA BREWER:

I don't know if I've done that recently. I will send one, though. And just as a side note, it's kind of hard to do that app until ... We need to do it about two weeks before travel because it won't allow us to enter dates until about two weeks before. You can download the app, but you can't import all of your information quite yet.

MASON COLE:

Okay. Maybe what we—

BRENDA BREWER:

But I will [inaudible] more information on that. And I'll send out an e-mail because there are some rules to follow.

MASON COLE:

Okay, that would be great and very helpful. Okay.

BRENDA BREWER: Thanks.

MASON COLE: Thank you. All right, let's move on on the agenda, then. Lawrence, the floor is yours for the Finance and Operations update, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Chair. Good day, everyone. Apologies, my camera will be off. The environmental here is real dark, and so I guess a picture up there is a better representation than what you would have seen live. You can see what I look like this evening.

And John Berard, that's a very pretty picture of you. I guess that was decades ago.

JOHN BERARD: Yes. I was goaded into that.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Great. All right, now. So up to open ICANN announcements. I guess one that is pretty important is that ICANN is planning a webinar on maintaining top-level domain health for the 24th of August. This is going to be 18:00 UTC. It's about a week from now. The content sounds quite interesting, as ICANN will also be using this opportunity to present a new initiative they call of the Knowledge-sharing Norms for DNS Naming Security. It might be of interest, especially to members who run security

companies and who have dealings around the DNS. Again, the date is 24th of August, and I'm sure this will be of benefit to a few.

Moving on, we have spoken ... Tim and Mason have covered arrangements that need to be married around ICANN75. We, as usual, would like to have and to keep a database of members who plan to physically be at Kuala Lumpur so that we can make the best arrangements to ensure that we have priority seating for members on our open meeting day, which, incidentally, this time around falls on a Sunday.

So if you plan to be physically at the meeting, please get the details across to Brenda so that we can make arrangements to have our members adequately taken care of. Not just the BC meeting, but also the CSG and GNSO-based meetings. So we will look forward to receiving those details. Just kindly leave Brenda a note, and proper arrangements will be made.

Happy to report to ExCom and members that, unlike the last meeting, I was able to finalize my travel arrangements today. So, kudos to ICANN, and thanks for providing the necessary documentation in time.

My apologies will go to a few members. So we have a few invoices still open, But my apologies to members who recently have had to make some inquiries around the validity of their payments, if their payments eventually got—thanks, Marie—to see their payments finally got to the BC account.

We recently transitioned our accounting from one accounting firm to the other, and this is the first time that we're actually working at having

ExCom managing the accounts. It's been managed all this while by an accountant. And so while the onboarding is going on, we are expecting that in a couple of days ahead, this will be completed and I'll be able to revert back to members who have been inquiring concerning the validation of their payments, about the status.

Apologies again. We've noted each one and as soon as we have words for you, we will get back to you to confirm that we actually got your payments. But in the meanwhile, what we've done is to apply credits to all of these members. And once we validate the payments, we will ensure that we have you notified. So even if you're not sure , at this point you have nothing to worry about. We have adequately taken care to ensure that your membership doesn't lapse within this period.

Many thanks to Scott for his updates on the NomCom selection that was just announced. And we want to thank you again for the time that yourself and Tola have spent in the process of working with the NomCom, knowing that this is quite engaging. Thank you again, and we're looking forward to having the new NomCom appointees take their seats after the ICANN75 AGM.

With regards to the ICANN75 newsletter, we are still running very, very low on submissions. Many thanks to Mason, to Tim Smith, and Imran for their articles. We had extended submission up to the 15th, and we still haven't received any new articles. So while we're working to fill the gap, we still just want to let members know that we still have a lot of space to accommodate anyone who has articles that they would like to submit and to see featured in the ICANN certified edition of the BC's newsletter.

At this point, I would like to take any questions. Otherwise, I'll yield the floor back to Mason.

MASON COLE: Any questions for Lawrence? Okay, very good. Lawrence, thank you very much. Outstanding update, as usual.

All right, friends. We have not a lot left on the agenda and we're running a bit early. So let me go to Item 5 and say is there any other business to raise for the BC today? Okay.

All right, in that case, let me just remind you ... Brenda, I believe our next meeting is not until the 8th of September. Is that right? Right before travel time for ICANN75?

BRENDA BREWER: Just a second. I'm looking. I think it is ... Yep, September 8th.

MASON COLE: Okay. September 8th at the usual time.

BRENDA BREWER: Correct.

MASON COLE: Okay. All right, very good. Thanks, Brenda. Okay, everybody, just mark that on your calendar, and we look forward to talking with you then. Otherwise, feel free to contact anybody on the ExCom for anything you

might need. And we look forward to seeing you in a few weeks. And we also look forward to seeing you in KL if you plan to travel there in person.

So everybody enjoy the last few weeks of summer. Brenda, thanks for your support. And BC is adjourned. Take care, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]